



Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

20150119 versions of ER & MDP

1 message

Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Fri, Jan 22, 2016 at 12:44 AM

To: Ed Henning <mred2@earthlink.net>, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Hello Ed, tara,

I had totally forgotten to send you my findings, hence the ridiculous hour of this e-mail, sorry.

Ed, attached is a spreadsheet in which I copy-pasted the two problematic tables. I have highlighted cells indicating which numbers are off. The formulas are to the right, outside the table with the borders, so you can see how I've come up with those highlights. I realize some of the discrepancies are problematic because of the way rounding errors creep in, but others I can't explain.

Tara, the table in the MDP on pages 5 & 6 looks like its from an older version of the ER where there was a basic data entry error that Ed & I have since corrected, so that table just needs to be replaced once Ed fixes the discrepancies I reference above. These corrections will then have to be carried through to the relevant subsequent parts of the MDP where they are cited again starting on p21. On p 27, the \$589,156 figure should be \$589,157 to match the figure in the database, but it is a matter of rounding, so I am not sure how this should be handled, but the consistency is necessary.

--

Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621



to Ed- ER 20150119 version check- calculations.xlsx

22K



Re: 20150119 versions of ER & MDP

1 message

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Edward Henning <mred2@earthlink.net>
Cc: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Mon, Jan 25, 2016 at 1:27 PM

Thank you both for your expeditious follow-up. I would deeply appreciate final resolution on this ASAP. I am pretty readily available to make any MDP edits needed, although I'm currently not clear on what may be needed. I addressed the rounding issue manually in my tables. If I recall correctly, there were only two places where it was off due to rounding - one by \$1 and one by \$2 (due to several sets of cents that would round down individually, but round up once summed.)

FYI - I am trying to hold the council office back from interference. They have been wanting to stick their oar into this for awhile.

Meanwhile, owners are facing the fact that a midyear or even fall start is very unlikely and they are very unhappy.

On Mon, Jan 25, 2016 at 1:06 PM, Edward Henning <mred2@earthlink.net> wrote:

Garen - I went through your worksheets for the VB charts and each of my charts checks out internally math-wise within each chart. I realize that when you use "cents" (as you have done and is not a preferred method for our big picture purpose) some of our in-cell numbers and sums work out slightly different but only, when rounded, at most - \$1 either way. This means that the formulae within my cells are internally correct, just a slightly different approach than you took. I used a factor of 5% to increase each program element total for each PBID year but then I used my pre-set and calculated Zone 1 and Zone 2 allocation factor to determine each zone's portion of each year's budget allocation vs your method of just multiplying everything by 5% throughout. This is where we are different and I feel that since these are merely future projections that can be altered quite significantly from what we are even showing, that my numbers are adequate for the purposes we are trying to achieve. Therefore I don't feel there is justification to alter what I have shown. We will correct any numeric differences between the MDP and ER for consistency.

From your messages I was under the impression that we were "miles" off in our numbers and calculations but that is certainly not the case.

Ed Henning, Principal
Edward Henning & Associates
760-868-9963

—Original Message—

From: Garen Yegparian
Sent: Jan 22, 2016 12:44 AM
To: Ed Henning , Tara Devine
Subject: 20150119 versions of ER & MDP

Hello Ed, tara,

I had totally forgotten to send you my findings, hence the ridiculous hour of this e-mail, sorry.

Ed, attached is a spreadsheet in which I copy-pasted the two problematic tables. I have highlighted cells indicating which numbers are off. The formulas are to the right, outside the table with the borders, so you can see how I've come up with those highlights. I realize some of the discrepancies are problematic because of the way rounding errors creep in, but others I can't explain.

Tara, the table in the MDP on pages 5 & 6 looks like its from an older version of the ER where there was a basic data entry error that Ed & I have since corrected, so that table just needs to be replaced once Ed fixes the discrepancies I reference above. These corrections will then have to be carried through to the relevant subsequent parts of the MDP where they are cited again starting on p21. On p 27, the \$589,156 figure should be \$589,157 to match the figure in the database, but it is a matter of rounding, so I am not sure how this should be handled, but the consistency is necessary.

—
Garen Yeghparian
213/978-2621



Re: 20150119 versions of ER & MDP

1 message

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Edward Henning <mred2@earthlink.net>
Cc: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Mon, Jan 25, 2016 at 1:27 PM

Thank you both for your expeditious follow-up. I would deeply appreciate final resolution on this ASAP. I am pretty readily available to make any MDP edits needed, although I'm currently not clear on what may be needed. I addressed the rounding issue manually in my tables. If I recall correctly, there were only two places where it was off due to rounding - one by \$1 and one by \$2 (due to several sets of cents that would round down individually, but round up once summed.)

FYI - I am trying to hold the council office back from interference. They have been wanting to stick their oar into this for awhile.

Meanwhile, owners are facing the fact that a midyear or even fall start is very unlikely and they are very unhappy.

On Mon, Jan 25, 2016 at 1:06 PM, Edward Henning <mred2@earthlink.net> wrote:

Garen - I went through your worksheets for the VB charts and each of my charts checks out internally math-wise within each chart. I realize that when you use "cents" (as you have done and is not a preferred method for our big picture purpose) some of our in-cell numbers and sums work out slightly different but only, when rounded, at most - \$1 either way. This means that the formulae within my cells are internally correct, just a slightly different approach than you took. I used a factor of 5% to increase each program element total for each PBID year but then I used my pre-set and calculated Zone 1 and Zone 2 allocation factor to determine each zone's portion of each year's budget allocation vs your method of just multiplying everything by 5% throughout. This is where we are different and I feel that since these are merely future projections that can be altered quite significantly from what we are even showing, that my numbers are adequate for the purposes we are trying to achieve. Therefore I don't feel there is justification to alter what I have shown. We will correct any numeric differences between the MDP and ER for consistency.

From your messages I was under the impression that we were "miles" off in our numbers and calculations but that is certainly not the case.

Ed Henning, Principal
Edward Henning & Associates
760-868-9963

—Original Message—

From: Garen Yegparian
Sent: Jan 22, 2016 12:44 AM
To: Ed Henning , Tara Devine
Subject: 20150119 versions of ER & MDP

Hello Ed, tara,

I had totally forgotten to send you my findings, hence the ridiculous hour of this e-mail, sorry.

Ed, attached is a spreadsheet in which I copy-pasted the two problematic tables. I have highlighted cells indicating which numbers are off. The formulas are to the right, outside the table with the borders, so you can see how I've come up with those highlights. I realize some of the discrepancies are problematic because of the way rounding errors creep in, but others I can't explain.

Tara, the table in the MDP on pages 5 & 6 looks like its from an older version of the ER where there was a basic data entry error that Ed & I have since corrected, so that table just needs to be replaced once Ed fixes the discrepancies I reference above. These corrections will then have to be carried through to the relevant subsequent parts of the MDP where they are cited again starting on p21. On p 27, the \$589,156 figure should be \$589,157 to match the figure in the database, but it is a matter of rounding, so I am not sure how this should be handled, but the consistency is necessary.

--
Garen Yeghparian
213/978-2621



Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Re: 20150119 versions of ER & MDP

1 message

Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Tue, Jan 26, 2016 at 10:51 AM

To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Cc: Edward Henning <mred2@earthlink.net>

Good Morning, Ed, Tara,

Tara, it seems my note was unclear, sorry. As far as the MDP goes, the only thing needing correction is the replacement of the whole table, you just have an old set of data. Theos enubers are used/referenced later in the MDP, so those will naturally have to be corrected, too. But, the data you need is the same as what Ed and I are hashing out, so you should wait 'til we things up.

Ed I understand what you have laid out, it's straightforward enough. I have asked for direction on this up our hierarchy since there's nothing inherently "wrong" in what you propose. The only discrepancies we should continue to talk about are those that are more than just a rounding up vs. down (or down vs. up). There are ten instances where this happens, I have lighted them by italicizing and "bolding" the numbers, and boxing the cells. These are all cases of, by way of example, \$12.45 becoming \$14, or \$26.00 becoming \$27. In at least two cases, correcting this type of discrepancy would eliminate the discrepancy in a lower cell that represents a total.

Garen

On Mon, Jan 25, 2016 at 1:27 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Thank you both for your expeditious follow-up. I would deeply appreciate final resolution on this ASAP. I am pretty readily available to make any MDP edits needed, although I'm currently not clear on what may be needed. I addressed the rounding issue manually in my tables. If I recall correctly, there were only two places where it was off due to rounding - one by \$1 and one by \$2 (due to several sets of cents that would round down individually, but round up once summed.)

FYI - I am trying to hold the council office back from interference. They have been wanting to stick their oar into this for awhile.

Meanwhile, owners are facing the fact that a midyear or even fall start is very unlikely and they are very unhappy.

On Mon, Jan 25, 2016 at 1:06 PM, Edward Henning <mred2@earthlink.net> wrote:

Garen - I went through your worksheets for the VB charts and each of my charts checks out internally math-wise within each chart. I realize that when you use "cents" (as you have done and is not a preferred method for our big picture purpose) some of our in-cell numbers and sums work out slightly different but only, when rounded, at most - \$1 either way. This means that the formulae within my cells are internally correct, just a slightly different approach than you took. I used a factor of 5% to increase each program element total for each PBID year but then I used my pre-set and calculated Zone 1 and Zone 2 allocation factor to determine each zone's portion of each year's budget allocation vs your method of just multiplying everything by 5% throughout. This is where we are different and I feel that since these are merely future projections that can be altered quite significantly from what we are even showing, that my numbers are adequate for the purposes we are trying to achieve. Therefore I don't feel there is justification to alter what I have shown. We will correct any numeric differences between the MDP and ER for consistency.

From your messages I was under the impression that we were "miles" off in our numbers and calculations but that is certainly not the case.

Ed Henning, Principal
Edward Henning & Associates
760-868-9963

—Original Message—

From: Garen Yegparian

Sent: Jan 22, 2016 12:44 AM

To: Ed Henning , Tara Devine

Subject: 20150119 versions of ER & MDP

Hello Ed, tara,

I had totally forgotten to send you my findings, hence the ridiculous hour of this e-mail, sorry.

Ed, attached is a spreadsheet in which I copy-pasted the two problematic tables. I have highlighted cells indicating which numbers are off. The formulas are to the right, outside the table with the borders, so you can see how I've come up with those highlights. I realize some of the discrepancies are problematic because of the way rounding errors creep in, but others I can't explain.

Tara, the table in the MDP on pages 5 & 6 looks like its from an older version of the ER where there was a basic data entry error that Ed & I have since corrected, so that table just needs to be replaced once Ed fixes the discrepancies I reference above. These corrections will then have to be carried through to the relevant subsequent parts of the MDP where they are cited again starting on p21. On p 27, the \$589,156 figure should be \$589,157 to match the figure in the database, but it is a matter of rounding, so I am not sure how this should be handled, but the consistency is necessary.

--

Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--

Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621



Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Re: 20150119 versions of ER & MDP

1 message

Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Tue, Jan 26, 2016 at 10:51 AM

To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Cc: Edward Henning <mred2@earthlink.net>

Good Morning, Ed, Tara,

Tara, it seems my note was unclear, sorry. As far as the MDP goes, the only thing needing correction is the replacement of the whole table, you just have an old set of data. Theos enubers are used/referenced later in the MDP, so those will naturally have to be corrected, too. But, the data you need is the same as what Ed and I are hashing out, so you should wait 'til we things up.

Ed I understand what you have laid out, it's straightforward enough. I have asked for direction on this up our hierarchy since there's nothing inherently "wrong" in what you propose. The only discrepancies we should continue to talk about are those that are more than just a rounding up vs. down (or down vs. up). There are ten instances where this happens, I have lighted them by italicizing and "bolding" the numbers, and boxing the cells. These are all cases of, by way of example, \$12.45 becoming \$14, or \$26.00 becoming \$27. In at least two cases, correcting this type of discrepancy would eliminate the discrepancy in a lower cell that represents a total.

Garen

On Mon, Jan 25, 2016 at 1:27 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Thank you both for your expeditious follow-up. I would deeply appreciate final resolution on this ASAP. I am pretty readily available to make any MDP edits needed, although I'm currently not clear on what may be needed. I addressed the rounding issue manually in my tables. If I recall correctly, there were only two places where it was off due to rounding - one by \$1 and one by \$2 (due to several sets of cents that would round down individually, but round up once summed.)

FYI - I am trying to hold the council office back from interference. They have been wanting to stick their oar into this for awhile.

Meanwhile, owners are facing the fact that a midyear or even fall start is very unlikely and they are very unhappy.

On Mon, Jan 25, 2016 at 1:06 PM, Edward Henning <mred2@earthlink.net> wrote:

Garen - I went through your worksheets for the VB charts and each of my charts checks out internally math-wise within each chart. I realize that when you use "cents" (as you have done and is not a preferred method for our big picture purpose) some of our in-cell numbers and sums work out slightly different but only, when rounded, at most - \$1 either way. This means that the formulae within my cells are internally correct, just a slightly different approach than you took. I used a factor of 5% to increase each program element total for each PBID year but then I used my pre-set and calculated Zone 1 and Zone 2 allocation factor to determine each zone's portion of each year's budget allocation vs your method of just multiplying everything by 5% throughout. This is where we are different and I feel that since these are merely future projections that can be altered quite significantly from what we are even showing, that my numbers are adequate for the purposes we are trying to achieve. Therefore I don't feel there is justification to alter what I have shown. We will correct any numeric differences between the MDP and ER for consistency.

From your messages I was under the impression that we were "miles" off in our numbers and calculations but that is certainly not the case.

Ed Henning, Principal
Edward Henning & Associates
760-868-9963

—Original Message—

From: Garen Yegparian

Sent: Jan 22, 2016 12:44 AM

To: Ed Henning , Tara Devine

Subject: 20150119 versions of ER & MDP

Hello Ed, tara,

I had totally forgotten to send you my findings, hence the ridiculous hour of this e-mail, sorry.

Ed, attached is a spreadsheet in which I copy-pasted the two problematic tables. I have highlighted cells indicating which numbers are off. The formulas are to the right, outside the table with the borders, so you can see how I've come up with those highlights. I realize some of the discrepancies are problematic because of the way rounding errors creep in, but others I can't explain.

Tara, the table in the MDP on pages 5 & 6 looks like its from an older version of the ER where there was a basic data entry error that Ed & I have since corrected, so that table just needs to be replaced once Ed fixes the discrepancies I reference above. These corrections will then have to be carried through to the relevant subsequent parts of the MDP where they are cited again starting on p21. On p 27, the \$589,156 figure should be \$589,157 to match the figure in the database, but it is a matter of rounding, so I am not sure how this should be handled, but the consistency is necessary.

--

Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--

Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621